

6-1-1969

The Opinion - Vol. 08, No. 06

Fuller Theological Seminary

Jerry Sheppard

Follow this and additional works at: <https://digitalcommons.fuller.edu/fts-opinion>

Recommended Citation

Fuller Theological Seminary and Sheppard, Jerry, "The Opinion - Vol. 08, No. 06" (1969). *The Opinion*. 122.
<https://digitalcommons.fuller.edu/fts-opinion/122>

This Periodical is brought to you for free and open access by the Fuller Seminary Publications at Digital Commons @ Fuller. It has been accepted for inclusion in The Opinion by an authorized administrator of Digital Commons @ Fuller. For more information, please contact archives@fuller.edu.

2.8.16
Archives copy



McALISTER LIBRARY
FULLER THEOLOGICAL SEMINARY
135 NORTH OAKLAND
PASADENA, CALIFORNIA 91101

the opinion

June 1969

vol. VIII, No. 6

The Opinion is published periodically throughout the school year by students at Fuller Theological Seminary, 135 N. Oakland Ave., Pasadena Calif. The Opinion welcomes a variety of opinions consistent with general academic standards. Therefore, opinions expressed in articles and letters are those of the authors and are not to be construed as the view of the seminary, faculty, student council, or editors of The Opinion.

*Editor in chief.....Jerry Sheppard
Assistant editor.....Marvin Erisman
Managing editor.....Sam Jeanrenaud*

Past issues of The Opinion are filed in the Reference Room of McAlister Library.

AN EDITORIAL INTRODUCTION

Fuller Seminary is going through an important transition at the moment. Institutions, like humans, start with a creative childhood. With age, a defensible reputation, and a sophisticated paternal security the most open and adventurous of the societies let the channel through which new students slide in and out become so slippery that students are less important in the overall operation. What starts out as routine becomes habit and in turn the dreaded "hardening of the categories." Fortunately, students at Fuller are being given a clear voice - an opportunity to express discontent by direct dialog with faculty and administration. The effort is constructive and in the highest Christian tradition.

This Opinion has been dedicated to be a record of the events of student concern to begin regular dialog in a more definitive way with the faculty and administration. We consider our investment in time and discussion to represent the intensity of that concern. This Opinion was compiled by Sue Ellen Porter and contains more than words and ideas, but a prayer that Christians can express their anxieties and that the Holy Spirit will guide both students and faculty to a level of understanding and communication far above the present. Our concern is that at Fuller, "community" should be a reality and not merely an ideal. Our concern is that our seminary represent the best in educational technic which responds to both the academic and student needs and yet maintains respect and honor for our faculty.

JS

A DOCUMENTED HISTORY OF THE FULLER STUDENT MOVEMENT
IN EDUCATIONAL CONCERN

--by David Foxgrover
Gene Terpstra
Stan Olson
Sue Ellen Porter et al.

During the 1969 winter quarter several students realized that there were large numbers of other students who shared the desire to see creative change in curriculum and pedagogy at the seminary and to see student participation at the decision-making level in these areas.

The question was then raised: how could we as students organize ourselves to address these needs and goals? Sue Ellen suggested we have a conference to show the student body the progress in educational techniques being made at other schools. After group discussion, we decided that a better approach at the time would be to publish a questionnaire to learn if the majority of students felt that real problems existed. The questionnaire was published, and the following page is the front piece of the questionnaire.

* * * * *

Dave Foxgrover received his B.A. from Lawrence College with a major in English Literature. As a graduating B.D. student he anticipates a Th.M. from Fuller and further studies at Claremont Graduate School. He has worked this year as the coordinator of the Inter Seminary Movement and as chairman of the ad hoc student Education Committee.

Gene Terpstra received his B.A. and M.A. from the University of Michigan in 1956 and 1964. He has taught College English Literature classes and is presently working in this capacity at P.C.C. As a Sr. B.D. student, he has served this year as president of the student body.

Stan Olson received his B.A. from the Univ. of Oregon in 1964 with a major in sociology. He served a Middler's year internship working with the Young Life Urban League program in central Harlem. He has been very active in campus and community programs dealing with Racial problems.

Sue Ellen Porter received her B.S. from the Univ. of Md. in 1964 with a major in microbiology. She has previously worked in several areas of medical research. This is her fourth year at Fuller. On the B.D. program, she is presently completing work on "The Theology of Contemporary Sex Roles".

FULLER LIFE STYLE QUESTIONNAIRE

Fact: You are.

Fact: You are a student.

Fact: You are a Fuller Theological Seminary student.

Question: Are you satisfied?

Are you a dissatisfied student?

Are you somewhere in between?

We would like you to know.

Who is "we?" We are a group of fellow students concerned about the life style of Fuller. We are grateful for our experience here, yet, we are convinced that it could be better. All too often the "study" of our educational home has an antique rather than modern decor. We are not angry radicals anxious to tear down the walls; rather, we want to replace some of the outdated "furniture." In this period of student upheaval we have chosen the route of the tongue rather than torch. Our strategy is responsible and realistic effort. But we will not be satisfied with endless discussion. We intend for meaningful discussion to result in significant action.

If action is to come, we need you. First, we need to know how you see Fuller; where are you helped and where are you hurt? The following questionnaire has been designed to take a minimum amount of your time. Any additional comments and/or proposals are welcome. Second, we hope this questionnaire will not be the end of our contact with you. We will need your assistance on task forces and committees. If you would like to help, please say so on your questionnaire or contact a committee member. Thankyou.

David Foxgrover, Chairman
Doug Matthews
Sue Ellen Porter
Jay Jarman
on behalf of the student Education Committee

P.S. We have set Tuesday, Feb.18, as the deadline for the questionnaire

The next question was: how could we effectively communicate student opinion to the faculty and administration?

At first we decided to make proposals based on the questionnaire results and submit the proposals to the Student-Faculty liaison Committee at the committee's next meeting. At that same meeting we would request the Student-Faculty Committee to call a general, open meeting with all students and faculty in attendance in order to discuss the student proposals. The Administration suggested that such a large meeting would be unwieldy.

We compromised, rejecting the idea that we go through the Student-Faculty Committee in a normal manner, and suggested that a large contingent of students attend a faculty meeting in order to present the student proposals.

We had two major projects before the Faculty meeting on April 22, 1969. First, we held an open meeting on April 8 at which students submitted proposals and ideas and at which time a student could nominate himself to be a member of the group which would meet with the faculty. Second, we met several times during the next two weeks to draw up specific proposals to be handed out at the faculty meeting. As a result of two weeks of deliberations we decided to use the faculty meeting as a forum to propose that five students be named to the Academic Affairs Committee and that this enlarged committee would discuss the specific proposals we had authored.

A week before the faculty meeting the administration suggested that the committee leaders meet with Dr. Hubbard and Dr. Fuller to discuss the naming of students to the Academic Affairs Committee. Although we knew that it was Dr. Hubbard's prerogative to name students to this committee (i.e. it was unnecessary for the faculty to approve our proposal), we decided to go to the faculty anyway, because we wanted a wider hearing.

On April 21, I placed a copy of the following letter in the box of each faculty member, so that each faculty member might consider the students' proposal ahead of time.

April 21, 1969

Dear Faculty member,

At tomorrow's Faculty meeting the Student Education Committee will submit the following proposal for your approval:

Whereas students desire to see education at Fuller Seminary continue to improve, and

Whereas students desire that education at Fuller Seminary be more student centered,

We recommend that five students (to be named by the Student Council) be added to the Academic Affairs Committee and that this enlarged Committee will:

- a) consider academic problems at Fuller Seminary and report its findings and proposals to the Faculty;
- b) extend to each Committee member the right to place items on its agenda and to vote;
- c) announce the time, place and agenda of its meetings so that interested faculty and students may attend; and
- d) hold its first meeting within two weeks following the committee's formation.

We are anxious to discuss with you this proposal and questions you may have about the Questionnaire and student feelings.

Most sincerely,

David Foxgrover, Chairman

At the April 22, faculty meeting we submitted one proposal for faculty approval, viz. that five students be named to the Academic Affairs Committee (in the hope that our proposal would be accepted). These are reproduced here, on pp. 8,9. and 10.

The faculty meeting on April 22, was a disturbing example of bad communication; yet it helped us all to realize that a real gap between faculty-administration and students did exist. The best way to express the faculty's reaction is to say that they could not comprehend why we were there or why we were making these requests. After I, as chairman, made an opening statement, there was only minimal give-and-take between students and faculty. At the end of the meeting, Dr. Hubbard stated that he did not want students to wrongly believe that the faculty could approve our proposal; such approval would be made at his discretion, and that he would consider our proposal carefully. The closing remark of the meeting was made to Dr. Hubbard by a student; he said; "We will watch you very carefully; and up to now we have gone through proper channels."

This last student remark expressed two feelings shared by all the students: first, all were disappointed that no action had been taken at the meeting; and second, that if nothing was done at the administration level, students would not sit idly by.

The following statement (p.11) which was posted April 30 shows that administration was quick and eager to act. Our proposal was approved.

The Student Education Committee selected 11 people (Erisman, McAlister, Tuttle, Terpstra, Porter, Wagner, Minnassian, Lisk, Shaw, Piper, Sheppard) from the nominations submitted; and from those 11 names the student council selected the final four. (Wagner, Terpstra, Erisman, Lisk)

The following was handed out by the student Education Committee to the faculty at the April 22 meeting.

PROPOSALS CONCERNING ACADEMIC AND STUDENT LIFE
(for consideration by the enlarged academic affairs committee)

I. PROPOSALS* FOR IMMEDIATE IMPLEMENTATION

1. Elective courses in Church In Mission should be established (cf. proposal of Jim Bidderman).
2. Course evaluation by students should be established as a regular procedure for all classes. The findings of these forms ought to be used to revise courses.
3. Attendance at lecture classes should have no bearing on course grade.
4. Language passages should be integrated into the week's discussion.
5. The assigned readings should be discussed in class.
6. Tests should be based on class material and assigned reading.
7. Mid-term exams should be designed for completion within a maximum of 40 minutes, finals within a maximum of 2 hours with the personal option of an extra hour for completion.
8. Student assistants should grade only objective tests and quizzes.
9. Re-evaluate the necessity to distribute grades on a percentage basis.
10. Where possible have students who have taken a class evaluate prospective tests in that class.
11. Deadlines should be set for the return of exams to the students.
12. No graduation credit should be given for Hebrew. A student successfully passing a Hebrew exam can thereby waive the necessity to enroll in summer Hebrew.

13. Ministry course assignments should be flexible enough to allow the student to adapt them to his vocational goals.

14. Employ a professional dietician or consultant for the refectory.

15. Students should be placed on all academic and administrative committees.

II. PROPOSALS* FOR IMMEDIATE CONSIDERATION

1. Hire a Black professor for the ministry department (cf. Olson's proposal).

2. Establish another ethics course earlier in the core course sequence.

3. Neglected areas within the core curriculum are
the theology of worship
sociological foundations of the church
understanding of cross-cultural ministries
theology of mission

4. Hebrew should be optional for psychology students (cf. Psyc. student curriculum committee).

5. Redefine the goal of language study to be to assist the student to do exegesis by teaching him how to use commentaries intelligently and to familiarize him with available lexical aids by means of a modified course of lexical word studies.

6. The faculty of each department should cooperate to:
eliminate overlap and gaps in course material and to
provide specific course descriptions for the catalogue
giving specific objectives, content, methods and pre-req.

7. Core courses should be sectioned (cf. Smedes) to facilitate in-depth discussion; lectures should be published (Fuller).

8. Screen and train teaching assistants.

9. Either raise the salary or provide free room and board for summer student teachers.

10. Seriously attempt to implement an alternative to the present grading system eg. pass-fail or the grad.school sys.

11. Steps should be taken to eliminate cafeteria waste & ineff.

*Note: these proposals are NOT arranged in any priority

PROPOSAL CONCERNING THE EDUCATIONAL MODEL AT FULLER
(for consideration by the enlarged academic affairs committee)

WHEREAS students have pointedly expressed their discontent with present educational structures at Fuller Theological Seminary, and
RECOGNIZING that meaningful educational reform requires rigorous research before significant recommendations can be made,

BE IT HEREBY RECOMMENDED THAT

1) an educational evaluation committee be established and that its composition and function be as follows:

a) Composition

1. Faculty--4 members
2. Students--4 members
3. Educational Consultant(s)

On the committee shall be one student and one faculty member from the enlarged Academic Affairs Committee.

b) Function

1. Conduct a six-month, expert, comprehensive analysis of the present educational system at Fuller.
2. Hold open meetings or hearings of which the time, place, and agenda are publicized
3. Submit published evidence collected, along with recommendations to students, faculty and Board of Trustees for immediate implementation.

2) an instructional materials design consultant be hired to help Dr. Bush and other interested faculty members to develop advanced educational systems for their courses for next fall.

Note: We recommend that when the Academic Affairs Committee considers this proposal, an educational consultant be present to give professional advice.

April 30, 1969

IMPORTANT

DR. HUBBARD HAS APPROVED the student Education Committee's proposal to enlarge the Academic Affairs Committee by appointing 4 or 5 students (we are still negotiating this point) to serve with the present 6 Faculty members

The Committee viewed its meeting with the Faculty on Tuesday, April 22, with mixed reactions. For the most part the faculty was pleased with our proposal and our handling of the meeting. Dr. Hubbard was less than pleased, feeling that we overemphasized student concerns and pedagogical problems, while ignoring past efforts in placing students on faculty and administration committees.

Since April 22, David Foxgrover has met with Dr. Hubbard to iron out differences, and the entire Committee met again with Dr. Hubbard on Tuesday, April 29. Both of these meetings were encouraging. The Committee wants to emphasize that we have re-established confidence in one another, without underestimating its disagreements with some of Dr. Hubbard's views.

DO YOU WANT TO NOMINATE YOURSELF OR SOMEONE ELSE TO SERVE ON THE ENLARGED ACADEMIC AFFAIRS COMMITTEE?

IT IS NOT NECESSARY TO HAVE SERVED ON THE STUDENT EDUCATION COMMITTEE.

GIVE YOUR NAME TO DAVID FOXGROVER (BOX 183) BY 9:00 A.M. THURSDAY MAY 1. The Student Education Committee will select 10 candidates, and the Student Council will select the final five names from the list of ten.

At a meeting with student representatives on May 6th Dr. Hubbard handed out the following guidelines for the functioning of the committee. At that time we agreed to name 4 students instead of 5--one senior, two middlers and one junior.

FULLER THEOLOGICAL SEMINARY

TENTATIVE PROPOSAL FOR ACADEMIC AFFAIRS COMMITTEE OF THE THEOLOGY FACULTY

May 6, 1969

1. Present composition of committee:

Dean Fuller, chairman; Dr. Bower, Ministry; Dr. Bromiley, Theology; Dr. LaSor, Biblical Studies; Dr. Daane, Pastoral Doctorate; Dr. Schoonhoven, Library.

2. Student members:

Two juniors, two middlers (preferably on a four year program) will be charter members of the committee.

It is highly desirable to have as much continuity as possible. And for this reason some thought should be given to selecting students who are definitely committed to complete their academic work at Fuller. Perhaps preference should be given to those who have at least two years to go in their program.

3. Selection of committee members:

- a. Faculty members will continue to be appointed by the president and Dean in consultation with the individual faculty member.
- b. Student members at this juncture will be chosen by the student council from a list nominated by the ad hoc education committee.
- c. In the future student members will be appointed by the student council under procedures set up by the council.

4. Term of office:

Ordinarily a student will serve until he receives his B.D. or his D.Th.P. degree. In cases where a student does not take his committee responsibility with full seriousness the student council will be empowered to replace him.

5. Rights of participation in committee procedure:

Each committee member, whether student or faculty, will be entitled to full voice, full vote participation.

6. Procedure for making curricular improvements:

- a. Any items that affect basic graduation requirements will be recommended by the committee to the theology faculty for approval. If the theology faculty approves, these items will be brought to the inter-faculty committee for approval and then to the joint faculties for final approval before being recommended to the board of trustees.
- b. Items involving significant curricular change but not affecting degree standards will be recommended by the academic affairs committee to the theology faculty for approval.
- c. Items involving minor changes in program need only the approval of the academic affairs committee, unless a faculty member requests faculty review.

7. Schedule:

It is hoped that the committee members will be appointed during the week of May 5 and that the committee would meet three times before the end of the quarter, once each during the weeks of May 12, 19 and 26. These meetings should not be more than 1½ hours in length.

8. Suggested agenda:

Review of the proposals for implementation and consideration submitted by the ad hoc committee and the establishing of the top few priorities and the tentative schedule within which recommendations shall be prepared, reviewed and approved.

9. Open hearings:

It is anticipated that there could be a quarterly public hearing during which the academic affairs committee would meet with interested students and faculty to review its progress and to entertain suggestions and questions.

MINUTES OF ACADEMIC AFFAIRS COMMITTEE MEETING

May 16, 1969

Present: Dr. Fuller, presiding, Dr. Bower, Dr. Bromiley, Dr. Daane, Mr. Erisman, Dr. Hubbard, Miss Lisk, Dr. Schoonhoven, Mr. Terpstra, and Mr. Wagner.

The meeting was opened with prayer.

It was moved by Dr. Schoonhoven, seconded by Mr. Terpstra, and passed that the proposal for Pastoral Theology 305, as distributed, be recommended to the faculty for acceptance in principle.

It was agreed that Dr. Schaper and the other supervisors, with the assistants, work out the details of responsibility for each man involved, and include a description of the evaluation procedure that would be followed in these courses.

Some time was spent in discussing the guidelines for the Academic Affairs Committee, and an attempt was made to establish priorities. No action was taken.

In the matter of student evaluation of teaching performance, Dr. Bromiley suggested that the Committee first consider whether any form of student evaluation of teaching performance was in order.

Respectfully submitted,

Calvin R. Schoonhoven

The following is a topical summary of items for the consideration of the Academic Affairs Committee. It was made up by Dr. Hubbard for the May 16 meeting. The numbers in parentheses refer to the student Education Committee's Proposals Concerning Academic and Student Life which was handed out at the April 22 faculty meeting (see pp. 8,9, and 10 of this Opinion issue). The topic in *italic* was added at the May 16 meeting itself.

May 15, 1969

FULLER THEOLOGICAL SEMINARY
SCHOOL OF THEOLOGY, ACADEMIC AFFAIRS COMMITTEE

SOME SUBJECTS FOR CONSIDERATION

- I. CLASSROOM CONCERNS
 - A. Course evaluation (I.2) B. Relationship of grading to class attendance(I.3) C. Examination procedures (I.6,7,10,11)
- II. GRADING
Consideration of changes in the entire system (II.10)
- III. STUDENT ASSISTANTS
Their function and compensation (I.8; II.8,9)
- IV. EVALUATION OF CORE CURRICULUM
 - A. To eliminate overlap (II.6) B. To fill in gaps (II.3) C. Possible additions(II.2) D. Consideration of sectioning (II.7) E. Preparation of course syllabe (II.7) F. More flexible assignments especially in Ministry courses (I.13)
- V. EVALUATION OF LANGUAGE PROGRAM
 - A. Its goals (II.5) B. Credit for summer Hebrew (I.12) C. Integration of language passages into course discussion(I.4)
- VI. BLACK FACULTY MEMBERS (II.1)
- VII. COURSES TO BE ADDED (I.1)
- IV. G. *Use of professional Educational consultants in course restructuring (see student Proposal Concerning Educational Model at Fuller, item 2).(p.10 of this Opinion issue)*

The following are key items not covered in Proposals from Student Committee

- VIII. IMPROVEMENT OF FIELD EDUCATION AND PRACTICA FOR MINISTRY COURSES

IX. DEVELOPMENT OF M.A. PROGRAMS IN YOUTH MINISTRY AND OTHER
ARFAS

X. PLANNING FOR ACCREDITATION VISIT OF A.A.T.S.

A. Strengthing of Th.D., B. Strengthening of D.Th.P.

MINUTES OF ACADEMIC AFFAIRS COMMITTEE MEETING
May 20, 1969

Present: Dr. Fuller, presiding, Dr. Bower, Dr. Bromily, Dr. Daane, Mr. Erisman, Miss Lisk, Dr. Schoonhoven, Mr. Terpstra and Mr. Wagner.

The meeting opened with prayer.

It was moved by Mr. Terpstra, seconded by Mr. Wagner that the minutes of the meeting of May 16 be approved and distributed. Passed.

It was moved by Mr. Wagner, seconded by Mr. Erisman, that the minutes of the present meeting be posted on the Student Council bulletin board.

It was moved by Dr. Schoonhoven and seconded by Miss Lisk that the principle of joint teacher-student class evaluation be accepted. Passed, with Dr. Bromiley dissenting.

The meeting was adjourned.

Respectfully submitted,

Calvin R. Schoonhoven
Secretary

MINUTES OF ACADEMIC AFFAIRS COMMITTEE

May 27, 1969

Present: Dr. Fuller, presiding, Dr. Bower, Dr. Bromiley, Dr. Daane, Mr. Erisman, Miss Lisk, Dr. Schoonhoven, Mr. Terpstra and Mr. Wagner.

The meeting opened with prayer.

It was moved by Mr. Terpstra, seconded by Dr. Schoonhoven, and passed, that the Committee recommend to the Theology Faculty that Pastoral Theology 305 be included as part of the Theology School curriculum, with the provision that 305e be taught by Mr. Morgan, assisted by Mr. White.

It was moved by Dr. Fuller, seconded by Dr. Bromiley, and passed, that the following action of the Academic Affairs Committee (May 20, 1969) be rescinded:

It was moved by Dr. Schoonhoven and seconded by Miss Lisk that the principle of joint teacher-student class evaluation be accepted. Passed, with Dr. Bromiley dissenting.

The meeting was adjourned.

Respectfully submitted,

Calvin R. Schoonhoven
Secretary

an explanation should be given to clarify the rescinding of the previously approved motion favoring teacher-student evaluation of classes. Dr. Bromiley said that he and some of the other professors could not accept the implications of student evaluation of professors, i.e., students' setting a value upon the professors and courses. From conversations in the committee, however, he felt that this was not the students' goal so much as opportunity to respond to and comment upon the materials and methods used in the courses. For joint faculty-student appraisal (as distinguished from evaluation), however, he thought there would be almost unanimous faculty support. In light of this, the committee felt that a program of course appraisal could be implemented in the fall, with consideration being given to the particular methods and form(s) to be used for such appraisal.

--Gene Terpstra

COURSE DESCRIPTION FOR PASTORAL THEOLOGY 305

Directed study with local ministers in southern California, with the aim of correlating several areas of the ministry in a practical program of mission. Seminars with the ministry faculty, with pastors, and with local ministers in mission. Selected readings and reports. Limited enrollment, by consent of instructor. Annually.

305a Pastoral Ministry: the pastor's ministry in the local church. Directed study with a local pastor that has as its aim the correlation of all areas of the ministry and their practical function in the parish. Seminars with the ministry faculty and pastors. Dr. Schaper.

305b Local Church Ministry: the larger ministry of the local church. Field education including exposure to effective, working programs in the local church ministry. Includes the study of youth ministry, ministry to senior citizens, visitation programs, church membership programs, prayer groups, evangelistic outreach programs, and other pertinent items. Dr. Schaper.

305c Home Ministries: para-church structures, M-1, M-2. Analysis and evaluation of the various structures of home ministries other than and without direct connection to local or denominational organizations, with emphasis upon those communities which are different both linguistically and culturally within the Western tradition. Extended over a period of three quarters. Usual prerequisite, M22. Enrollment limited. By consent of instructor. Dr. Winter.

305d Cross-Cultural Ministries: para-church structures, M-3. Survey of southern Californian communities which are drastically dissimilar to the Western tradition, including evaluation of the ministry structures other than and without direct connection to local or denominational organizations in those communities. Enrollment limited to six students. Usual prerequisite M22. Extended over a period of three quarters. Dr. Winter.

305e Social Concerns: the social dimensions of the church's ministry. The nature of the church's social ministry. Study in some or all of the following areas: humanism vs. Christianity; theology of community, of confrontation, of celebration, of Christian service, and of sex. Seminars with the faculty, and analysis of types and methods of involvement. Mr. Morgan, with Mr. White.

The student assistants (Church in Mission Chairmen) for 1969-1970 are as follows: 305b - Jack Daniel; 305c - Jay Bartow; 305c - Doug Ericsson; 305e - Bill Coff. Grading for each section will be done by the instructor. Each section (b-e) will meet at the discretion of the instructor.

--Jim Bidderman, CIM Secretary

THE PROPOSAL FOR A BLACK PROFESSOR

--by Stan Olson

Recently I circulated a proposal on Ethnic Involvement and Christian Unity. Students have responded well with signatures and dialogue concerning the issues in the proposal.

The short range goal of the proposal is for the Seminary to hire a qualified minority group pastor: a man of warm evangelical commitment, deep spirituality, personal sensitivity, social awareness and outstanding academic qualifications. Dr. Elliott J. Mason, Pastor of Trinity Baptist Church in Los Angeles, is recommended. He received the S.T.M. from Oberlin College, studied at the University of Edinburgh under a Fulbright Grant and was awarded the Ph.D. from U.S.C. in 1968. The involvement of American Churches is one of our most glaring weaknesses. This includes a history of discriminatory, paternalistic and irrelevant training of future ethnic ministers in conservative, evangelical seminaries. The seminary must take care of its own backyard by opening up opportunities for qualified ethnic administrators and faculty. They are needed to help further sensitize Fuller students to the demands of their future ministries and help provide a more meaningful education for ethnic students.

The long range intent of the proposal is that we attempt to find solutions to the following needs in the Academic Affairs Committee next fall and include these in the Ten-Year Planning. We need research programs through the existing schools of Missions and Psychology in ethnic churches, and a complete Biblical and theological understanding of ethnic relations. In the Ministry Department, we need a liaison with ethnic churches who will provide counseling and in-service training with students working in these churches, and to develop programs of evangelism and a relevant teaching of Biblical theology, of unity in fellowship and service, and of justice in our churches.

The following was posted on the Board of Declaration May 28, '69.

PROPOSAL FOR AN EDUCATION CONFERENCE

This year we, as students have successfully gained a responsible part in the processes of curriculum improvement. As we work together, an underlying dialogue concerning Christian models for student power is beginning to emerge. Together we are recognizing the need for the organization of some type of public forum in which well articulated views may be presented.

Looking forward to next year, our discussion also will necessarily have to focus on the specifics of technical educational improvements. Opinions in this area are often as facile as they are numerous and varied. Uninformed easy solutions all too quickly draw reaction and counter-reaction that degenerate into meaningless emotional confrontations. One thing is apparent; we as theologians, pastors and students have at best only meager knowledge of rapidly developing technical possibilities in education. As a group, we are not really qualified to discuss specific technical changes without somekind of exposure to the spectrum of professional experience on these very issues.

Therefore, in order to create an informed context in which constructive discussion can take place, I suggest a seminary education conference which would:

- 1) Draw on the resources of educational technologists and others experienced with new educational models (eg. Missions-School), the student proposed Education Evaluation Committee of the Ten Year Plan, Fuller Theologians and Fuller students, in order to:
- 2) Inform, clarify and interact on the:
 - a) theological implications of new education models
 - b) theoretical possibilities " " " "
 - c) physical feasibility " " " "

If you are interested in helping work on this conference, (which will be under the auspices of the Social Concerns Committee) please see me or Bill Goff, or indicate such below. I would also be interested in your comments.

In our documentation of the history of student growth, there is not room to detail the faculty's movement with us. Here we can only say that one of the most significant factors is the tremendous amount of time and energy Dr. Hubbard has given to discussion with us. Besides the committee meetings already mentioned, there was a mid-winter President's convocation with open student discussion and a six hour meeting with the old and new student council representatives. The latter meeting especially helped clarify for the students the existing structures and procedures for any institutional innovations. Also, the difference in perspective as to the overall purpose and goals of the seminary was better recognized. I think, the least one could say is that areas of fruitful future dialogue are being discovered along with the channels and readiness to work out creative approaches. Certainly much more could be said about our growth in understanding the physical limitations of seminary resources anywhere from faculty energy to hard, cold cash. If we are to see new growth, very much hard work lies ahead. Yet, the ground in which seeds can take root is being turned over, broken up and prepared on both sides. In the President's reaction, his very keen analysis, his undefended candor and his unflinching willingness to learn indeed do set a tough model for us and for our future work. The following are edited portions of Dr. Hubbard's chapel talk from the Thurs., May 29 PRESIDENT'S CONVOCATION. (The editor here takes the responsibility for any roughness of style that may have resulted in the transition from conversation to written form or in the condensation of materials.) --SEP

EXCERPTS FROM THE PRESIDENT'S CONVOCATION
May 29, 1969

The fourth priority must be the bringing of certain curricular changes. Now out of the discussions which will, I hope result in certain curricular changes I have come to certain conclusions which you are probably wondering why it took me so long to catch on to. Part of this is the generation gap. Eventhough I lecture on the generation gap all across the country, to feel the generation gap in your tummy is another thing....

The first conclusion that I feel fairly strongly about and want to work out ways to implement is the relationship between learning and doing. Since, say the free speech movement in Berkley in 1964, we will never be the same in academia. We have tended in academic work to break sown the relationship between theory and practice so that we do our theory and then

later carry out our practice. I think that there is probably something not only out of step with the way the modern mind thinks and acts about this older pattern but I think there is something nonbiblical about too tight a division....If I feel anything of what is going on in our campuses today it is that it is hypocritical to know that problems exist without at the same time doing something to solve the problems and understanding the problems clearly while the problem solving or problem attacking is going on. Now, the ramifications of this for our ministry curriculum alone are very serious. And I feel personally that we have to work closely as a ministry department next year to wrestle with the relationship between the classroom and practice, between the classroom and field education and so forth. We are just beginning with programs like sensitivity training and a strengthened homiletics and speech program and a start at field education. We are just beginning what has to be really another style somehow, another attitude towards curriculum in the area of ministry particularly.

The second thing is that part of the learning process has to be to a certain extent, the setting up of that process and the executing of that process and the summarizing of the ways in which this process can be improved. In other words, the active-passive relationship which has existed in some phases of American education has to break down and we have to work out ways as a student body that we work together on the agenda of courses and then on the suggested ways in which a course can be improved....I'm saying that I for one and I think I speak for some of my colleagues, are going to take another look at the way we are teaching; and are going to ask ourselves whether we can open the way for better learning by having more student participation in the preparation and execution of the class.

The third point that has hit me in our discussions is that there is a spiritual hankering on the part of a great many students that is not at this stage being dealt with either within the student resources or the faculty structure. We have to ask ourselves in our drive for community what the Lord may be saying to us about spiritual nurture, about Christian growth about depth of dedication, about a commitment to prayer, to worship, to spiritual disciplines which we have not yet come to grips with....I feel that we must ask ourselves what we ought to be doing that we are not doing as a community to provide the kind of spiritual growth and enrichment in this academic context that will bring about the kind of discipleship that alone humanly speaking will bring church renewal in our

day....I think the importance of modeling is coming to me all the more clearly. As a faculty and students, what we are as persons is in the long run going to be more important than specifically what we teach or what we say. We have to ask ourselves are we becoming the kinds of persons in whom others will find the spiritual realities that God has made clear in Jesus Christ.

The only other concern that I want to share with you is the concern for communication....Another place where television and mass media has caused great problems is in communications and one of the things I have found out in the last few weeks is that students don't think anything is going on unless they know that it is going on or unless they see that it is going on....Now there are certain things that have to be done by private diplomacy, and anyone who knows me knows that I believe in coffee cup diplomacy. I have not yet put a closed circuit television camera in my office so that there will be broadcasts in all the hallways of what's going on. The United Nations is more public than the average academic institution; Congressional committees in the senate are more public than the average academic institution. That's the way it is and it probably will remain somewhat that way given what we are like as academic people. But where I really need help in addition to all these other areas is how to let the seminary community in regularly on what is going on so that we can have the support of your prayer and your interests and your suggestions. In this day when we believe in direct confrontation, when all of us ourselves see on television what is going on, representative government does not work the same way in an academic institution. I'm convinced of this. You have students on committees; I'm not so sure how you use them. I'm not sure yet how far we really trust, because we are raised in a climate where it is not really a matter of just checking with a messenger, we know ourselves what is going on through the public media. Yet, in academic institutions we don't have the same access to public media....

Now the last thing that I want to mention is my strong conviction that part of the tension which has arisen in these past few weeks has arisen because of my inability to understand that what the student body was really calling for was what to me sounds like a fresh approach to education; and yet to you is a sort of indignant approach because of who you are and where you are in your stage in life. I couldn't figure out why there was as much restiveness as there has been because I kept saying that I know that there is hardly any seminary in the country that is doing a better job than we are,

I know that we are many times better as an institution than we were in the past. When I compare the program that you get with the program that I had when I was here, it's cheese and chalk in quality. I mean that we are just so much better as an institution than we were ten, fifteen years ago academically, educationally, pedagogically, and when I make that comparison I can't figure out where the restlessness comes in. But I've come to the conclusion that what you are really saying is that you can't just keep improving the old way; that what is needed is a fresh approach in communication, in curricular planning, in the ministry courses and so forth. Now it's one thing for me to begin to understand and have some vision of what I think is necessary and what the Lord is saying to all of us through these conversations and it is another thing to implement them. That's going to take a lot of time and a lot of hard work but I wanted you to know the status of my understanding or lack of it at this stage and then we'll go on from there.